

Application Serial No. 10/719,483

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected all pending claims. Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 28, and adds new claim 29, in order to more clearly articulate the inventive subject matter.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, because items 31 and 34 illustrated in Figure 3 are not described in the specification. The specification does describe items 31 and 34, but inadvertently fails to correctly identify said description by item number. Applicant apologizes for the error, and herein amends the specification to include the proper item numbers. No new matter is added, as the amendment to the specification only adds the correct item numbers. The substantive descriptions of the items themselves were in the specification as filed. Applicant respectfully posits that the amendment to the specification rectifies the objections to the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claim 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to the phrase "may be" in independent claims 1 and 15. Claims 1 and 15 are amended herein such that the words "may be" are deleted. Applicant respectfully posits that this amendment resolves any indefiniteness that may have previously existed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 10-11, 14-19, 24-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edlund. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 as amended recites "returning a first list of search results [to a user] in response to [the user's search] query, said search results each being associated with at least one site; receiving...input from said user, said... input identifying search results of interest from among those search results within said first list; providing said user [a]...second list

Application Serial No. 10/719,483

of search results comprising said search results of interest; and allowing said user to visit sites associated with said search results of interest from said second list without having to select and return to said first list of search results.” In other words, a user performs a search, and a list of search results are returned to the user. The user indicates which results are of interest, and the specified results of interest are added to a second list, which is provided to the user. The user can then visit sites of interest without having to select or return to the first list.

The above described limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Edlund. Instead, Edlund describes using past popularity statistics to determine the ordering of entries on a single list provided to a user in response to a search query. See col. 3, line 52 - col. 4, line 21. List entries chosen by users are associated with the query that yielded the results, and stored in a database, thus maintaining a record of the most popular entries on a list generated by a specific search query. See col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 21. When subsequent search queries are made, this popularity information is utilized to sort the resulting list before presenting it to the user. See col. 4, lines 6 - 21; col. 6 line 1 - col. 7 line 5. Only one list is presented to the user: the list of search results sorted according to popularity. One query results in the generation and presentation of one list.

Nothing in Edlund discloses or suggests providing a user with a second list at all, much less “providing said user said second list of search results comprising said search results of interest” as recited by claim 1. Edlund merely provides a single list, sorted by popularity. Thus, Edlund also fails to disclose or suggest “allowing said user to visit sites associated with said search results of interest from said second list without having to select and return to said first list of search results.” Although Edlund’s list is sorted by

Application Serial No. 10/719,483

past popularity, a user wishing to visit sites on the list must do so through the list itself, and thus must return to it in order to visit additional sites thereon.

Claims 2-5, 10-11 and 14 are dependent from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 15-19, 24-25 and 28 are apparatus claims similar in scope to claims 1-5, 10-11 and 14, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1-5, 10-11 and 14. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that the additional recited limitations of the dependent claims are all anticipated by Edlund.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9, 12, 21-23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Edlund and Ehrlich. Claims 7-9, 12, 21-23 and 26 all dependent from an independent claim discussed above, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions that there exists a motivation to combine Edlund and Ehrlich, and that such a hypothetical combination would disclose or suggest the claimed limitations.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Edlund and Rishe. Claims 7-9, 12, 21-23 and 26 all dependent from an independent claim discussed above, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions that there exists a motivation to combine Edlund and Rishe, and that such a hypothetical combination would disclose or suggest the claimed limitations.

Application Serial No. 10/719,483

Applicant respectfully posits that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all objections to and rejections of the claims have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims as amended. If the Examiner would like to discuss this matter, Applicant's attorney can be reached at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey Brill
Reg. No. 51,198
Glenn Patent Group

Customer No. 22,862